

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

MICHAEL JONES, #259166,)	C.A. No. 3:04-1830-TLW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	WRITTEN OPINION AND ORDER
ANGELIA JOHNSON-COVINGTON,)	
SERGEANT (SGT.) AT EVANS)	
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; AND)	
CALVIN QUICK, LIEUTENANT AT)	
EVANS CORRECTIONAL)	
INSTITUTION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

In this *pro se* case, plaintiff Michael Jones, an inmate now or formerly of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, alleges that the defendants violated his constitutional rights by improperly handling his delivery of mail. Specifically, the plaintiff alleges that the defendants unlawfully opened a package addressed to him and refused to give him the enclosed books. The defendants deny these allegations and have filed a motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 17).

By Order filed October 25, 2004, the petitioner was advised of the summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond. On December 2, 2004, the plaintiff filed a response to the motion for summary judgment.

This matter now comes before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R.

McCrorey to whom this case had previously been assigned. In his Report, Magistrate Judge McCrorey recommends that the defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. As reasoned, in part, by the Magistrate Judge:

...[p]laintiff fails to show that defendants violated any of his clearly established constitutional or statutory rights.

No party has filed objections to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. As noted above, no objections have been filed to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

A *de novo* review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is **ORDERED** that the defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 17).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
United States District Court Judge

May 17, 2005
Florence, South Carolina